

HUMAN EVENTS SUBSCRIPTION RATES GO UP JULY 1

Extend your subscription at present low rates.

See Page 4.

THE LIBRARY

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Human Events

THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 25

June 23, 1960

Section 1 — News

ROCKEFELLER: *Mixed up millionaire* (page 1)

LBJ: *Oiling them up for L. A.* (page 1)

NIXON: *Soaring after the U-2* (page 2)

HOUSING: *Attack on sound money* (page 3)

FOREIGN AID: *Passman stops waste* (page 3)

Get-Rich-Quick Rockefeller: For some time, critics have dubbed Governor Rockefeller a "political Wallingford." As the echoes of Nelson's last abortive attempt to stop Nixon die down, this metaphor seems even more apt.

Many GOP politicians now think that the impatient Governor has not only eliminated himself from this year's political picture, he has also in all probability "gone for broke," permanently. He's reminiscent of that fictional character, Get-Rich-Quick J. Rufus Wallingford, whose fantastic financial schemes always ended in bankruptcy, with the sheriff closing in. (Wallingford had a henchman, the unforgettable Blackie Daw, not unlike the wild Emmet John Hughes, Rocky's braintruster.)

Today, Nelson's "blue-sky" political sales talk has blown up, and the consensus is: he calculated that Nixon would lose this year, that thereafter his warnings to the GOP would be confirmed and he would be the predestined leader of the Republicans in 1964. But this realization has so angered the rank and file of the party, that it seems unlikely they will ever forget or forgive; especially if Nixon loses.

Indeed, it is recalled that Nelson must face reelection for Governor in 1962. His political support in the Empire State is so demoralized that the way is open to other hopefuls who may aspire to replace him. There is State Senator Mahoney, long a thorn in Rocky's side; and there is also Rocky's nemesis, former GOP National Chairman, Len Hall.

The latter started to run for GOP nomination for the Governorship in 1958, but Rocky and his millions forced him out of the nomination race. Since then, Hall has worked as a dedicated—and skillful—aide to Nixon. It is unlikely that Hall would resist the temptation to oust Nelson in 1962.

Japan: Domestic political reaction to cancellation of Ike's trip to Tokyo: favorable to Ike. People will say "he did his best"; "Reds are to blame." If the Democrats try to criticize Ike, it will boomerang.

Foreign reaction—a big blow to US prestige around the world.

Informed Capital reaction: The CIA is to blame for faulty intelligence estimates of Japan. Dulles' outfit should have realized the strength of the Red fifth column in Japan and should have advised the President weeks ago to cancel his trip.

Black Gold: The Big Battalions are maneuvering for position in the upcoming Democratic Convention in Los Angeles. The eleventh-hour effort of Senator Lyndon Johnson to win the nomination rates as formidable, in the eyes of Capital observers, because it enjoys the backing of the largest aggregation of money—the oil industry. The black gold of petroleum does not flow, it oozes; and thus-wise it penetrates indirectly all sorts of cracks and crevices of the political system. Actually, Lyndon—with the support of the oil interests, which he has long protected—now taps resources far greater than the millions of Poppa Joe Kennedy.

Some convention delegates may well be bought outright by cash, but many more will sway from the indirect pressure of the Black Gold. Thus, on Capitol Hill, it is recognized that Democratic politicians, in and out of Texas, have long drawn help for campaign expenses from Texas oil firms. The word has gone down the line to these fat cats to exact pledges for Lyndon for the nomination or else Long distance wires are rather active these days.

Furthermore, members of Congress remain vividly aware that no matter who wins in the Presidential election, the Democrats will hold the Senate, and that Johnson will remain Majority Leader, with a clear memory as to who have been his friends. He can kill their pet bills, or he can pass them—and the men in Congress never forget that, when they feel the pressure.

Fighting alongside of the Tall Texan is Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. The latter never wearies of reminding gatherings of politicians that he, possessing the same power as Lyndon, will be Speaker again next year. (Some Republicans may dissent, but the chances that Mr. Sam will hold that

chair again are good.) Mr. Sam emphasized this point at the Texas convention last week, and forthwith the Rayburn-Johnson combination steam-rolled a refractory "liberal" minority.

Meanwhile, word has got around that Lyndon, who shrinks from no political deal of any character, has had his emissaries approach the Third Man, whose power may well prove decisive in the smoke-filled rooms of Los Angeles. He is Walter Reuther. The outcome of this tentative is not yet ascertainable. Those who know the Labor Boss doubt that he will encourage the Texan.

But those who know Johnson take an opposite view.

When a caller enters Lyndon's office in the Capitol, he is usually greeted by a blunt, "What's your proposition? What can I do for you?" And thereafter business is usually transacted. The hour may come, at Los Angeles, when Reuther may be constrained, despite his dislike of the South and Southerners, to ask, "What's your proposition?" No one doubts that Lyndon will offer something tempting. It's nature would certainly be likely to chill the spines of gullible fat cats who think that the Texan is "sort of conservative." On Capitol Hill, no one overlooks any bets.

Forecast of Nixon's Chances: Last week the Vice President sharpened his image as the candidate who can best defend America from Khrushchev. He said that those (meaning Kennedy and Stevenson) who wanted Ike to apologize to the Russian leader for the U-2 incident were wrong: that, instead, Khrushchev should apologize to the US President for his scuttling of the summit. Capital observers deemed Nixon's statement "very effective political campaign warfare" and augury of further aggressive forensics of this kind. If the present electric international atmosphere continues, Nixon should increase his lead in the race up to November.

Some believe this climate will continue during the election period. They reason, as follows: The Kremlin will abstain from bellicose moves in Europe, but from all signs will test out the Free World defenses in the Far East. No Red action of any military significance will take place until the end of the monsoon season (about Aug. 15). Then the Communists may push and prod in the Formosa Strait, Korea or in Indo-China. Already the US forces are being reinforced in Asian bases in preparation for such moves.

Should such a crisis develop, the Democrats would be constrained to back up the President as they pledged in the resolution (engineered by Democratic Senator George) in 1955.

Assuming that the US popular temper remains firmly anti-Khrushchev—with the American appeasement forces silenced or very much on the defensive—Nixon could then reap great political benefits by a firm stand against aggression. Any Democratic candidate for the Presidency who would be cast in the role of "Khrushchev's favorite" would go down to defeat before inevitable popular reaction. So runs the speculation in the Capital.

Capitol Camera: At their San Antonio state convention last week Texas Republicans pledged their 54-vote delegation to Senator Barry Goldwater for the Vice Presidential nomination after backing Nixon for the Presidency.

- Although Herter and top level State Department officials encourage no plans for another summit, the talk among the "middle"-level bureaucrats centers on ways and means of steering policies so as to have a summit meeting at an early date. The middle-level (filled with "liberals"), which writes the papers on special subjects and recommendations for week-by-week turns of policy, usually gets its way sooner or later.

- *Republicans happily note that the GOP convention is now assured comedy relief with the news that Harold Stassen will go to Chicago and stump for Rockefeller.*

- Representative H. R. Gross, spendthrift-baiting Iowa Republican, finds another boondoggle in foreign aid: \$100,000 to Israel to teach how to operate banks and lending institutions.

- Ex-Roosevelt White House aide Jim Rowe, who managed Hubert Humphrey's West Virginia campaign, reportedly now works for Lyndon Johnson.

- The House Ways and Means Committee approved a bill allowing businesses and unions to deduct lobbying expenses from taxable income. If passed, the bill will be an equalizer between the two groups as labor is little hampered by taxable income.

- *Lyndon Johnson was named the outstanding Senator in a Newsweek poll of 50 Washington correspondents, but Stu Symington received no mention, although each newsman picked four.*

- "Underdeveloped" Cambodia recently denounced the US as "imperialistic," but has pocketed \$21.7 million in aid this year. Anti-Red and for-free-enterprise Malaya hasn't taken a dime in 1960.

- What-does-this-have-to-do-with-Welfare department: Dr. Brock Chisholm, former director of the World Health Organization, told the National Conference of Social Welfare in Atlantic City that the US Constitution was "obsolete."

Labor: The inflationary decision by the National Mediation Board to award the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers an 11½ cent hourly increase was seen as "incredible," but not surprising, by Capitol Hill labor experts.

It is incredible, according to these experts, because the railways (which had actually sought a wage cut) are still struggling to keep their heads above water despite the passage of the 1958 Transportation Act which gave some measure of relief.

But the wage increase, which will no doubt set the pattern for the industry and its 800,000 employees, can only be financed through higher prices (hard to put into effect because of tough competition from other forms of transportation) and the unlikely elimination of featherbedding.

But the decision hardly comes as a surprise. The chairman of the board was none other than New Dealish Archibald Cox, professor of law at Harvard and the man Senator Kennedy relies on for pro-union legislation. Cox also worked in the Labor Department under Roosevelt and was appointed by Truman to the Wage Stabilization Board during the Korean War ("where he stabilized wages upward," cracked one Washingtonian).

Cox's views on labor are well summarized in his own textbook on labor law for Harvard students. In it he justifies the labor union's right "to exercise the power of a monopolist" which he says amounts to the American way of "self-help" and "self-advancement."

Housing: The \$1.2 billion Housing bill voted by the Senate last week could have been the first step toward a "managed housing economy" if not for the efforts of conservatives like Senator Wallace F. Bennett (R.-Utah).

Bennett sponsored a successful amendment eliminating the national housing goal clause putting the burden of housing construction on the Federal government instead of private enterprise.

Opponents of the bill still consider it a raid on the taxpayers, since they point out there is no housing emergency. The moderate housing decline in 1960 was expected, 1959 being the second best in history.

They also point out the \$350 million voted for urban renewal can't even be used by the Urban Renewal Administration, whose officials say they can supervise the spending of only around \$400 million a year. They have nearly that much available now.

Sound money men are also appalled by the largest single item—\$500 million to be spent on college dormitories. Loans to colleges don't have to be paid back for 30 to 40 years, whereas private loans of this type are normally paid back in 20. Also much of the funds will be spent for college fraternities and sororities since the Housing and Home Finance Administration ruled in 1958 that they are part of "college housing." (See HUMAN EVENTS May 5, 1960.)

Boxing Scandals: Senator Estes Kefauver, who may be defeated in the August 4 Tennessee Democratic primary by conservative Andrew "Tip" Taylor, once again goes headline hunting with a probe of evil in boxing. The first witness was former champ Jake LaMotta. "Hideaway" witnesses will be called and convicts pulled from jail to testify about alleged fixed fights of yesteryear.

The Senate caucus room again looks like a Mafia encampment—all of which makes for great news copy, if little else.

Noted is that there is neither big money nor heavy gambling in the fight game today, and the bouts being investigated were held a dozen or more years ago. But few feel the Coonskin Crusader is as concerned with results from his little drama as

he is with polishing his fading crime buster armor in time to save his diminishing political fortunes.

Foreign Aid: Credit for the nearly \$800 million slashing of Ike's \$4 billion foreign aid request by the House Appropriations Committee goes to Otto Passman (D.-La.), chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the mutual security program. (Administration pressure may force restoration of the cuts.)

Passman, who last month threatened to "give birth to twins on the House floor" if the President got what he asked for, has been a constant and knowledgeable foe of the program. Despite the Administration's pressure, Passman's keen criticism of the waste in the foreign aid operation was so devastating that even some "liberal" Democrats went along with his view on the matter.

While the press generally reported that the reduced funds meant a decrease in our military program overseas, Passman pointed out the Mutual Security Program—even without a nickel being appropriated this year—could draw on some \$4 billion in unexpended funds.

Conservatives, who have been warning Congress that it is losing control over the spending policies of the Executive, were also pleased by the fact the appropriation bill prohibits new aid programs without prior congressional approval.

Connally Reservation: Evidence accumulates that a big storm is blowing up for the coming American Bar Association meeting (in Washington, on August 28), concerning the Connally Reservation to our membership in the World Court. That Reservation gave the US the decision as to whether an issue referred to the Court was governed by American domestic jurisdiction. The internationalists in Congress tried to eliminate the Reservation early in this session, but public protest proved so strong that they have dropped the matter for this year. The matter, however, continues to be a burning political topic.

The upcoming American Bar Association will probably have to face the issue again on August 28, according to high figures in the Association. Last February, the House of Delegates of the ABA, in a meeting in Chicago, dealt with a proposal to rescind the 1947 action of the ABA which was in opposition to Senator Connally's Reservation.

Pressure was strong for rescinding, but the internationalists won by a hair-line. The vote count indicated that those who wanted rescinding were gaining many adherents.

In recent months, state bar associations in Tennessee, South Dakota and Arizona have voted to rescind the ABA position against the Connally Reservation. Others may follow suit in coming months. According to former ABA President Frank Holman of Seattle, chances are favorable for a successful battle to rescind the 1947 stand of the ABA at the lawyers' meeting here the end of August. Holman, long-time advocate of the Bricker Amendment, has been one of the leaders of the movement to retain the Connally Reservation.

Television's Slanted Sacco-Vanzetti Drama

By PAUL JONES

What is adult television?

TV is not precisely our field, but the question we have just posed has been nagging us ever since we sat through two programs concerned with the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Critics in general found the direction routine, the presentation partial, and the characters over-simplified. Yet, said many, this was adult television, and we should have more of the same.

Presumably it was adult because it dealt with a controversial subject which agitated many people 25 years ago. On the other hand, it is scarcely adult to present a complicated issue in the crude colors of a children's primer.

The "goodies" and the "baddies" in the melodrama we saw were neatly divided. The prisoners at the bar, their defense counsel, their friends and families, everybody who was on their side glowed with the inner light of perfect innocence and unselfish devotion. Their adversaries, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, its Governor, the Prosecutor and the Judge, not to mention the police, came off very badly.

The judge was represented as doddering and senile, with a persecution mania; in point of fact, he was 63 at the time of the first trial, and sat on the bench for 13 years thereafter, retiring only after his house was blown up by a bomb.

The Governor was shown as a monstrous combination of political ambition and dishonest double-dealing. The prosecutor was ready at all times to falsify evidence, with the ready cooperation of an unprincipled police force.

These, of course, are routine characterizations in the sort of fictional courtroom drama that TV writers love. But the Sacco-Vanzetti case was supposed to be a documentary, with some of the accuracy of history and some of the responsibility that reporters have.

One difficulty that must have confronted the playwrights was the fact that Governor Fuller, seven years after the first trial, named a public commission to look into the case and offer impartial advice on whether justice had or had not been done. The members of this tribunal were A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard, Samuel Stratton, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Robert Grant, a former Probate Court judge.

On August 6, 1927, they rendered a report on their findings.

They said: "The inquiry that you have asked the committee to undertake seems to consist of the three following questions:

1. "In their opinion, was the trial fairly conducted?" To this, their answer was yes.

2. "Was the subsequently discovered evidence such that in their opinion a new trial ought to have been granted?" To this they answered no.

3. "Are they, or are they not, convinced beyond reasonable doubt that Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty of the murder?" On this their verdict was guilty, after an exhaustive examination of the record, and long questioning of ten jurors (one had died, another was in Florida) and available witnesses.

A key paragraph read: "To the committee the jury seemed an unusually intelligent and independent body of men, and withal representative, 7 of the 12 appearing to be wage-earners, one a farmer, two engaged in dealing in real estate, a grocer. Each of them felt sure that the fact that the accused were foreigners and radicals had no effect upon his opinion, and that native Americans would have been equally certain to be convicted upon the same evidence."

They examined the evidence for and against in the greatest detail, weighing the credibility of witnesses and the statements of the accused, as well as the evidence of the ballistic experts. "The fact," they said, "that persons accused are or are not Socialists or radicals of any type neither increases nor lessens the probability of their having committed the crime, and should be left wholly out of account."

The basic question, of course, is: Did the prisoners get a fair shake? And on the record, but not on TV, the answer had to be yes, unless you assume an enormous conspiracy to defeat justice.

Reprinted with permission of the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE INCREASE				
HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates go up July 1. You may EXTEND your subscription at present LOW rates—if you act NOW. Fill out this coupon:				
HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S. E., Washington 3, D. C. Please EXTEND my subscription for the period marked.				
CHECK	SERVICE DESIRED	Rate July 1	Renew NOW at	
☐	1 year subscription	\$12.50	\$11.00	Saving you \$ 1.50
☐	2 year subscription	25.00	17.00	Saving you 8.00
☐	3 year subscription	37.50	23.00	Saving you 14.50
☐	4 year subscription	50.00	29.00	Saving you 21.00
☐	5 year subscription	62.50	33.00	Saving you 29.50
☐ Remittance enclosed		☐ Bill me		☐ Bill my company
Name _____				
Street _____				
City _____ Zone _____ State _____				

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months \$3.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher
Assistant Editors

JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., Business Manager FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

HUMAN EVENTS

NEWS FOUR

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 25

Section II

JUNE 23, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

7 more days!

**HUMAN EVENTS
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
GO UP JULY 1**

ACT NOW . . . EXTEND YOUR SUBSCRIPTION—SAVE!

HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates must go up July 1st. But we want you as a loyal reader to have a chance to **EXTEND** your subscription at the **OLD** rate.

Advancing costs force the HUMAN EVENTS subscription price to be raised to \$12.50 a year. This rate will still be far lower than that of any other major Washington newsletter. Kiplinger has raised his price from \$18 a year to \$24 a year.

The schedule below shows the **SAVINGS** you can make by **EXTENDING** your subscription **NOW** at the **PRESENT** rates.

Human Events 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please **EXTEND** my subscription. I want to take advantage of your **PRESENT** subscription rates. I have marked below the number of years to **ADD** to my present subscription period.

	NEW Rate	Present LOW Rate	Saving You
One Year	\$12.50	\$11	Saving you \$1.50
Two Years	\$25	\$17	Saving you \$8
Three Years	\$37.50	\$23	Saving you \$14.50
Four Years	\$50	\$29	Saving you \$21
Five Years	\$62.50	\$33	Saving you \$29.50

☐ Payment Enclosed☐ Bill Me☐ Bill My Company

NAME

STREET

CITY ZONE STATE

HUMAN EVENTS

--- COMMENTARY

If a nation values anything more than **FREEDOM**, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too.

—W. SOMERSET MAUGHAM.

Khrushchev's Friend Backs Kennedy

Wealthy Mrs. Cyrus Eaton Will Vote for Jack in L.A.

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

It is all very embarrassing to the supporters of Senator Jack Kennedy, but a leading backer of the front-running Democratic Presidential hopeful is none other than Mrs. Cyrus Eaton, wife of the multi-millionaire pal of Nikita Khrushchev.

Mrs. Eaton is, in fact, a Kennedy-pledged delegate from Ohio, under the direction of Buckeye Governor Mike DiSalle. The Lenin prize-winning Eaton and his crippled 38-year-old wife are currently touring the satellite countries of Communist East Europe.

Interviewed by Red newsmen in the satellite nations, Mr. and Mrs. Eaton have assured Communist leaders that election of a Democratic President will usher in a new period of peaceful relations between the "socialist and capitalist countries." (Mrs. Eaton's political mentor, Mike DiSalle, declares Adlai Stevenson is the "logical" Secretary of State under a Jack Kennedy administration.)

Touring behind the Iron Curtain, the two Eatons have called for US abolition of the "war-mongering" Radio Free Europe and Voice of America. They have called for American concessions in the fields of disarmament and European policy. They have been met with enthusiastic response from Communist editorialists everywhere they've gone.

Interviewed by this reporter in the United States, Mrs. Eaton declared she was hitching her political star to Jack Kennedy. Election as a convention delegate begins her political career. In a few years she hopes to take on "reactionary" Republican Bill Minshall for the House. She then expects to challenge the immensely popular conservative Democrat, Frank Lausche, for his Senate seat.

Mrs. Eaton declares the Communists have secured a "monopoly on morality" over the Western powers. Backing Kennedy, she pledges an immediate end to arms development, disarmament on Soviet terms, abolition of all overseas bases, and support of the Red "peace race."

The left-wing fight to repeal the so-called "loyalty-oath" provision of the National Defense Education Act for students accepting Federal scholarship loans has been defeated. Observers doubt the repeal proposal of Senator Jack Kennedy, approved by a Democratic-controlled committee, will ever come up for a vote.

Even if the Senate did vote to repeal the pro-

'AND DON'T CALL ME; I'LL CALL YOU!'



vision, reversing the position it took only a year ago, it would be impossible for the bill to pass the House.

The powerful chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Graham Barden of North Carolina, assures this reporter he will fight the bill with all his power.

His power should be more than enough, and the Kennedy proposal will not leave his committee. Things could be different next year, however, as Barden is retiring from Congress.

The new chairman will be Harlem's radical Adam Clayton Powell, who is firmly opposed to the loyalty oath provision. He has no objections to the principles of federal aid, however.

Stevenson Double Talk

From the New York Daily News

Adlai Stevenson writes Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt an involved letter which she interprets as meaning that Adlai wants another go at the Presidency this year. Adlai then (1) says, "I am not a candidate," and (2) has an aide of his say that Adlai was only speaking technically when he said he wasn't a candidate. You figure it out; we can't.

We shudder to think, though, of having as President a man who can't answer Yes or No to the simplest question and has a positive genius for keeping his friends as well as his foes completely in the dark as to where he stands on any question.

'Independent Vote' Is a 'Liberal' Myth

From the Cincinnati Enquirer

For some time we have been skeptical about the existence of a large bloc of independent voters—men and women who make up their minds only after studying the campaign promises. These independents are said to constitute a swing vote capable of determining elections. The proposition usually is advanced by "liberals" as a means of persuading conservative candidates to water down their conservatism.

We now have the warrant of scholarship for our dubiety. A book published by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, "The American Voter," finds that the independent voter is not the "intelligent, alert and careful student of issues" he has been represented as being. In brutal fact, he is likely to belong to the one-fourth of the electorate too indifferent to choose between the parties.

The book purports to be the result of the "most exhaustive study" ever undertaken of national voting habits. It amply confirms our eclectic observation that "liberals," whatever advice they offer the Nixons, always end up voting for the Adlai Stevensons.

Conservative Tests Liberal In Real Congressional Race

By James Helbert in the Pittsburgh Press

Those who complain that there's no difference between the two parties and that all candidates talk alike should take a look at the 28th Congressional District in Pennsylvania.

That district includes 18 of Pittsburgh's 32 wards and the two candidates do NOT talk alike or think alike about government and public problems.

An Economics Teacher

Democrats are running the incumbent, Representative William S. Moorhead, Shadyside attorney. Republicans put up Dr. Arthur O. Sharron, of Squirrel Hill, a teacher of economics at Duquesne University.

Now, labels are tricky things which sometimes become unstuck, but it seems safe to call Mr. Moorhead a liberal and Dr. Sharron a conservative.

In fact, Mr. Moorhead's record in the last session of Congress pleased Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) so much that they gave him a perfect score of 100 per cent for voting "right" on measures that ADA considered vital. (Representative Elmer J. Holland, South Side Democrat, got a similar mark.)

Representative Moorhead wants more Federal aid for housing, education, health and welfare and for the other projects so dear to the hearts of liberals.

But Dr. Sharron can get pretty steamed up over high taxes, big government, gigantic unions whose leaders run over the dues-paying rank-and-file—and Mr. Moorhead.

When Dr. Sharron announced his candidacy, he said he was amazed at At-

Houston Democrats Eject Dominant Leftist Faction

By Raymond Moley

It has mystified many that while Dallas has generally elected conservative Democrats or Republicans to the state legislature and Congress, Houston has so often gone the other way. Since 1956 the liberal wing of the Democratic Party has had a majority in the Harris County Committee, and since 1958 liberal Democrats have represented the city in the legislature. Houston, in fact, has been the center of activity of the liberals, who go by the name Democrats of Texas, or DOT.

This has been due to the apathy and indifference of the business community to its political responsibility.

An Awakening

After the disastrous election of 1958, however, an awakening took place. The direction of this revival was to organize in the precincts and get out the vote of all those who preferred conservative government.

There were two phases of this movement. Searcy Bracewell, a former state

senator and well-known lawyer, undertook to elect a conservative Democratic County Committee, while Walter Sterling, a businessman and the son of a former Texas governor, enlisted business and professional workers for conservative candidates for the eight seats in the state legislature.

An organization called Freedom in Action, created by Judge Ellwood Fouts, materially assisted in the conservative drive.

Businessmen Pitched In

It should be noted that all of this effort was within the Democratic Party. The top management of many important businesses encouraged employees to get active in their precincts. Good candidates were selected. And an organized effort was made in all of the 266 precincts.

Legal steps were taken to stop fraudulent voting, which has generally been a factor in primary elections.

Another factor which had hitherto handicapped conservative Democrats was the multiplicity of candidates on their side. The liberals were careful not to split their vote. Hence, in all but two of the races for the legislature only one conservative was entered.

Primary Turnout

On primary day, May 7, a veritable revolution took place. Large numbers of conservatives appeared at the polling places. In some precincts three times as many people voted as in previous primaries. In the heavily industrialized Pasadena district it has been previously considered normal for only one of the 15 precincts to vote conservative. This time the conservatives won in ten.

The result was a heavy majority of conservatives on the Democratic County Committee. One of the eight candidates for the legislative seats was unopposed, but of the remaining seven, three conservatives and two liberals were chosen. For the remaining two there was a run-off on June 4th. A conservative won one and a liberal won the other.

Electing Delegates

Texas has the very interesting method of electing delegates to the county conventions of the parties at precinct "conventions," held in the evening of the primary in stores, homes, and on street corners. This year a large turnout of conservatives appeared. The conservatives swept these, too.

As a result of this upset, the moving spirit of DOT, Mrs. R. D. Randolph, is expected to be ousted as Democratic National Committeewoman from the state.

The result shows what can be done when conservatives make a real effort under intelligent leadership. Houston has set an example for many other large cities in the nation. The potential vote is there. But it needs leadership to get it to the polls.

Eichmann Case: Israel vs. Argentina

By William Zuckerman in the Jewish Newsletter

The reactions to the capture of the Nazi murderer, Adolph Eichmann, by the Israelis have been mixed. Most people were surprised, many puzzled, some pleased and others even elated over what seemed to be an act of eternal justice. Yet, people could not rid themselves of a vague feeling of uneasiness about the means by which it was accomplished. As the sensational particulars of the international kidnapping plot became known, the uneasiness grew into dissatisfaction and worry over the complications which may follow.

No one has stated more clearly the first reaction of the average liberal American to the event than an editorial in the *Washington Post*, entitled "Jungle Law" (May 25). It begins by saying, "There will, of course, be a great deal of sympathy in the world for the desire of the Israeli government to prosecute and punish Adolph Eichmann . . . The plain truth, nevertheless, is that neither respect for the rule of law, nor respect for the sanctity of human life will be served by the projected trial." It then proceeds:

Tainted with Lawlessness

"Everything connected with the proceedings against Eichmann is tainted with lawlessness. If, as reported, he was abducted from another country, international law was violated. The crimes with which he is to be charged were committed in Germany and Austria; Israel has no jurisdiction to try the case. In any event, Israel can try him only under *ex post facto* status. To try him according to the forms of law is to make a mockery of law. All that the government of Israel can do in this case is to wreak vengeance; it cannot secure justice.

"Israel appears to be claiming a right to deal with Eichmann on the ground that his offenses were committed against Jews. But although there are a great many Jews in Israel, the Israeli government has no authority to speak for Jews elsewhere or to act in the name of some imaginary Jewish ethnic entity. In attempting to do so, it could do grave disservice to Jews of other nationalities."

Open to Question

The strongly pro-Israel and pro-Zionist *New York Post* said editorially: "The decision to try Eichmann in Israel, despite the understandable satisfaction that may be derived from this grand historic irony, is open to serious question . . . Eichmann is a product of the Nazi German state; his crime falls into the same category for which Germany is still prosecuting and sentencing others like him . . . Eichmann should be tried in Germany by the German Republic."

Another reaction reflecting non-Zionist Jewish opinion is worth recording. Dr. Max Bretzfelder, a former judge in pre-Nazi Germany, who had many personal encounters with nationalists, both German and Jewish, during the turbulent period of the Nazi accession to power, writes to the *Jewish Newsletter* (May 21):

"The capture and abduction of Adolph Eichmann by the Israeli secret police is creating quite a legal problem. Hitherto,

Nazi war criminals were tried either by an international tribunal or by the governments of the States against whose citizens the crimes were committed. This time Eichmann is to stand trial in Israel, in accordance with a special Israeli law of 1950 that everyone who committed war crimes against the Jews in Nazi times can be judged by Israeli courts and sentenced to death.

Should Extradite to Germany

"How this law is compatible with international law is difficult to see. Eichmann was a German—maybe he still is—who committed his crimes in Germany by order of the German government. The Jews whom Eichmann killed were Germans, Poles, or citizens of other countries, but never Israelis. The fiction of the Israeli Nationality Law that every Jew in the world is potentially a subject of the State of Israel is not recognized anywhere as valid. She should extradite the German war criminal to Germany to stand judgment."

Even some Zionist Jews have reacted critically to the Israeli procedure of abducting Eichmann and conducting a trial. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, the Jewish Agency, the World Jewish Congress and other bodies, who next to Ben-Gurion, is considered the spokesman for the Zionist world, publicly proposed at a session of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem (May 31) that *Israel should invite other governments, whose people suffered most severely under the Nazis, to participate in the Eichmann trial in order to give the appearance of an international tribunal. But the Israeli government rejected the suggestion and stressed that Israel alone would deal with the war criminal.*

The Jerusalem correspondent of the *New York Times*, Mr. Fellows, in a number of dispatches reported dissatisfaction also in Israel with the forthcoming trial. He quoted one Jerusalem mother explaining her anxiety about the effect so horrid a story would have on her children. She said:

"Full of Hates"

"I do not want them to grow up full of hates. I have tried to explain gradually that those were incredible times and that people sometimes do incredible things when they are full of hates."

Why then was it necessary to revive hatred and painful horrors which have begun to recede into history and in the minds of the unfortunate men and women who suffered them? Why raise a host of complicated international problems which can only discredit Israel as a violator of international law and action as were Communist and fascist governments? Why endanger the national status of all Jews in the Diaspora?

The official reason for the trial, given by Premier Ben-Gurion in a letter published in the official Government newspaper *Davar* (May 28), is (a) to revive the tragedy of the Nazi extermination of the Jews in the minds and hearts of the Israeli youth who know little about it; (b) to warn the new enemies of Israel (the Arab States), who also dream of exterminating the Jews, that Israel

is aware of the association between them and the Nazis and is prepared for them.

To this writer, there seem to be two other explanations for the Israeli government's action. (1) The need to counteract the bitter criticism in Israel and in the Diaspora of Ben-Gurion's strongly pro-German policy. This policy has brought about one of the most curious paradoxes of the post-war period: Germany, the perpetrator of the greatest tragedy in history, is now Israel's closest ally and friend. She is the most generous contributor to the up-building of Israel, even surpassing the American Jews. The fact is that West Germany is now the most important factor in Israel's economy. This is a hard pill for Jewish nationalists in and outside Israel to swallow, and criticism of Ben-Gurion's policy of refusing to identify Adenauer's Germany with Nazi Germany is the source of the strongest internal opposition to Ben-Gurion. The bringing to justice of an important war criminal charged with the murder of millions of Jews may serve as an antidote to that criticism.

Losing Lustre

(2) Another reason is both more remote and more fundamental. After its first decade of existence, Israel is rapidly losing its ideological lustre as the National Homeland and Center of all Jews in the world. The Jews of the Western countries and the governments of all countries of emigration have put a practical stop to Israel's Ingathering (mass immigration), the cornerstone of Zionist ideology. The Zionist movement, the ideological progenitor of Israel, is in a state of crisis, rapidly nearing collapse. The next Zionist Congress, in December, will probably be the last. The world is also disillusioned with Israel's political and military policies. Twelve years after its establishment, the State is more deeply hated by the Arab world than it was at its inception. The danger to world peace as a consequence of this is graver than ever.

Divert Attention

Under such circumstances, Israel and her ideology are in a desperate plight from which there seems to be no escape. Both need a powerful ideological shot in the arm, and nothing can accomplish this aim more effectively than a political trial, the modern equivalent of the ancient "circus and bread." The Russians and the Germans did it and Israel, another state based on an ideology, is powerfully tempted to try it. The focus of international attention on Israel, which such a trial is sure to bring, may raise the flagging self-esteem of the Israelis and revive their faith that they are still a world-nation. The blaze of publicity may divert their attention from their larger troubles and failures. The revival of the rancors of the past and the anxieties of the future may appease the critics of Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy. Above all, Israel's act, as the avenger and protector of all Jews, not only of its own citizens, will re-affirm more dramatically than anything else that she is still the center of world Jewry, not merely another small state in the Middle East. The temptation to stage such a spectacle of ideological diversion was too strong for the Israeli government to resist.

How Small Business is Duped

Part III: Con Man In the White House?

By JAMES L. WICK

Albert Norman is a member of the "inner circle" of a Liberal Candidate for the Presidency. His political education is described in a series of letters to his brother, Albert. Letters one through nine appeared in June 9 and June 16 editions of HUMAN EVENTS. The tenth letter follows.

Letter No. 10

DEAR ALBERT: Our law practice has been confined to big corporations. For that reason, I have been quite oblivious to the problems of small business. In my job here, I've been listening to the pleas for help from small businessmen trying to get to Our Candidate. After they have gone, I hear the raucous comments of the "inner circle." As one "committee" was leaving, Pat O'Connell, campaign chief, asked how dumb can businessmen be to ask us for legislative programs they ought to know that Reuther would veto.

"Some of those small businessmen calling on us"—he says—"are such dopes they don't know we have to choose between them and COPE (the AFL-CIO's political arm). We can't satisfy both so we choose the one who can deliver us the most votes. That ain't small business."

Whenever I'm hunting for understanding, I drop into the hotel room of my newspaper friend, Roy the Reactionary.

I asked: "What is Pat O'Connell talking about? Professor Callowan-Booth told me Our Candidate has the 'finest program in the world to help small business.'"

I added that "I was very much impressed by Professor Callowan-Booth's credentials. He teaches economics at Harvard. He ought to know what small business needs to prosper. He has written text books that are used in a couple thousand high schools and his last book, *New Plateaus for America*, is on the best seller list. Who should be a better authority? The professor told me that Our Candidate's principal program called for quadrupling the lending power of the Small Business Administration. He also wants to adopt a suggestion he got from Jimmy Roosevelt to put a branch lending office in every congressional district."

As I rambled on, Roy smiled incredulously. Then he asked:

"Where in the name of all that is holy did you get the idea that just because Professor Callowan-Booth teaches economics at Harvard, he knows anything about the subject? Why, he's one of the professors who warned the country during 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945 that, sure as shooting, there would be 10 million unemployed after the war—unless the government had a gigantic WPA program ready to keep people from going hungry. He warned that if the American people went hungry, they would surely go Communist. He also made profound pre-

dictions that all Europe would go Socialist after the war and the United States had better show hostility to the pro-capitalist parties in European countries or the Socialist governments he expected to be in power everywhere would retaliate by looking to Moscow for guidance instead of to us.

"Today these predictions look silly, indicating both an immature gullibility and an inadequate understanding of economic forces. Nevertheless, professors like Callowan-Booth still are quoted by publications edited by Liberals and by politicians and political groups of red and pink tendencies—as well as by Harvard. Economists like Henry Hazlitt, and writers like Moley, Chamberlin, Fertig and others who have been right all along get short shrift in 'intellectual circles.' They just aren't respectable—in the opinion of Liberals."

"You are indulging in *ad hominem* arguments," I told Roy. "Forget who made the suggestion. I'd like to have you talk about the proposal itself. Don't you think it would help small business to quadruple the lending resources of the Small Business Administration? It looks so good because in the last week alone a dozen small businessmen have told me they are desperately short of capital."

Roy snorted. "Alex, what those businessmen need is a chance to make a profit. If they can make a profit, they can accumulate their own capital. If they need more capital than they can accumulate, they can borrow from the banks or insurance companies or they can sell stock if—and this is the IF—if they can show that they can make a profit. Right?"

That sounded convincing, but then I asked, "What keeps competent small businessmen from making a profit?"

"Two things," replied Roy. "Taxes and unions."

He went on: "The Liberals who claim to be the only true friends of small business are in fact its worst enemies. First they favor Big Spend programs that have to be paid for with High Taxes. Second, they are the puppets of the unions whose policies destroy small business."

I said: "I understand the tax angle, but I wish you'd explain the union problem."

"It's simple. The Liberals, to get the support of the union bosses, have been forced to give blank-check power to the union monopolies. In setting the stage for wage negotiations, union leaders concentrate their fire upon an industry's largest and most profitable corporations. The huge profits, of these big corporations, claim the unions, justify increases of 10, 20 and 30 cents an hour. However, once a wage contract has been obtained for the major unit or units in an industry, the argument is gently dropped into the waste basket. Small companies are abruptly told that the issue is no longer one of profits, but of 'equal wages for equal

work.' If the small companies say they cannot pay the wage rates granted by the big companies, they are bluntly told: 'So what? If you can't pay, go out of business. The big companies can serve your customers. In fact, we'd rather deal with a few big companies. It's all you small business outfits that cause us so much trouble. Sign for the same wage scale and fringe benefits granted us by the big companies or we strike your plant.'"

I broke in: "Roy, may I stop you long enough to ask why Professor Callowan-Booth is backing a bigger and better Small Business Administration?"

"Why, you ask? Because there are four million business proprietors with six or eight million votes in this country. The more the Liberals cater to the labor barons, the more shrill must be their cry that they, not the conservatives, are the real friends of small business. The labor bosses won't allow them to do anything about high taxes or union restrictions, so their Big Brain boys—like Callowan-Booth—are given the assignment: 'You've got to think of something. We need small business votes.'"

"Government loans to small business have a number of cute gadgets that aren't on top for everybody to see. It's another clever left-wing program to dupe businessmen into voting for their enemies and deserting their friends."

I said: "Quit your denunciations, Roy, and tell me just how these things work. That's what I'm waiting for."

Roy said: "I'll have to start with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC was set up about 1930 as a depression program but it was continued during World War II as the Federal agency to grant loans to defense plants. However, when World War II came to an end, RFC did not quit. Government agencies never quit when their work is done. Under Truman, RFC kept right on making loans. As could be predicted, scandals began breaking out all over the place. RFC had to be liquidated. But the Liberals know a good thing when they see it: government loans to small business—that's the way to prove their undying love for small business. Now actually, government loans to small business are like morphine in the hands of a quack: they avoid the issues of excessive taxation and the crippling power of the union monopolists. Secondly, they furnish another way to bribe businessmen to support left-wingers whom otherwise they would oppose. Liberals, instead of searching for ways to make it easier for small businessmen to make a profit, resort to the old shell game to divert their attention from the vital to the phony. Liberals want the test of a politician's love of small business to be (1) the size of the appropriations voted for the Small Business Administration's capital; (2) the upper limit of the loans that can be made by SBA and (3) the relaxing of lending standards.

"One Liberal Senator actually told SBA officials that the agency wasn't losing enough money; he wanted looser standards so he could get more loans for businessmen in his state.

"The aim of the congressional 'small business bloc' is to make it look as if bankers and insurance companies lend money only to big business and discriminate against small business. They imply that most of the four million small business firms* would soon be bankrupt except for the undying devotion of the Liberals in Congress.

"But curiously, here again appears the same Liberal pattern of 'bribing the people with their own

money.' A small business owner seeking a loan from SBA may run into interminable delays and endless red tape. The natural thing is to get the help of his Congressman—even if the businessman is a right-winger Republican and his Congressman is a left-winger. The Congressman gladly writes a letter to SBA; instantly SBA jumps to attention—and for a good reason: the larger the number of Congressmen indebted to SBA for favors done to constituents, the better SBA's chances for increased capital appropriations, the greater the opportunity for SBA officials later to move into high salaried jobs with private industry.

"A Liberal Congressman rubs his hands with glee whenever he can get a loan which will politically emasculate a Republican businessman of standing and influence. 'One more Republican bites the dust,' he cries to his secretary. 'Having gotten him that loan, how can he help my Republican opponent next November? His sense of gratitude won't allow it.'"

"Jimmy Roosevelt, Democratic Congressman from California, is as phony a friend of small business as was his father and he is as shrewd a politician. Jimmy wants an SBA lending office in every congressional district in the USA; he wants the additional lending capital necessary to handle the multiplied number of applications.

"Jimmy would be indignant at the suggestion that he is an unconscious tool of the Communist conspiracy, but his plan is just one more step toward making business dependent upon the pleasure of the Federal Government.

"Jimmy—a typical Liberal—votes for every important measure that adds to Federal expenditures, for every Federal absorption by the Federal Government of state and local functions, for every measure that will reduce private initiative and private incentives. Jimmy claims all the programs he votes for are intended to reduce the appeal of communism. Jimmy also claims to be an anti-Communist despite his ferocious hatred for the House Un-American Activities Committee, which he seeks (by resolution in every session of Congress) to liquidate. Well, Jimmy is one of your Liberals, Alex."

More next week, Albert.

Yours, Alex

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "HOW SMALL BUSINESS IS DUPED" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

*Editor's Note: SBA made loans last year to 6,000 small business firms, about one-sixth of one per cent of the small businesses in the USA. Average loan about \$45,000, so the businesses that got loans were not so small. Most loans were for 5 years.

The 'Missile Gap' Is The Symington Gap

By WILLIAM SCHULZ

Assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr.

IN JANUARY OF 1953, W. Stuart Symington III was a freshman Senator from the State of Missouri earnestly in search of what politicians call an "issue." Seven years later, having found his "issue," and milked it for all its political worth, W. Stuart Symington III had catapulted himself into the race for the Presidency of the United States.

The Senator's issue—the US Defense and Military Posture—seemed logical enough. Symington was a millionaire Truman bureaucrat who had served four years in top defense positions following the Second World War. To many he was a modern-day Paul Revere warning a complacent nation of an imminent danger from abroad.

Three months after his arrival in the Senate, Symington had assumed the mantle of non-partisan defense expert, a mantle that was to become increasingly frayed as the years went on. Speaking at the University of Virginia, on May 1, 1953, Senator Symington dramatically implied that his former Commander-in-Chief, President Harry Truman, and Defense Secretary Louis Johnson had led this country into the Korean War. Declared Symington:

"If the nation had faced its national defense problem realistically five years ago, there probably would have been no Korean War We learned a sad lesson from our former economy program."

As the *Baltimore Sun* noted, Symington's reference was a thinly veiled attack upon the "economy drive of Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense prior to the Korean War." What is indeed ironical is that Symington himself, as Secretary of the Air Force, was a key supporter of the Truman-Johnson economy campaign. In June of 1949, for instance, Symington told the nation:

" . . . In our efforts to achieve military readiness we must not tax ourselves into defeat by economic collapse. It makes no difference whether the purpose of unbearable taxation is to finance military preparedness. The results would be the same; economic collapse"

A month later Symington was acting as Administration cheerleader before the national convention of the American Legion:

"The Air Force believes that this country can have adequate military strength without committing

economic suicide, and without surrendering to regimentation. . . .

"That is what Secretary Johnson believes and that is what he is working for. The Air Force supports him, a great American and your former National Commander."

Mere weeks before he "quit in protest" (as he told a nationwide TV audience recently) against Defense Department penny-pinching, Symington was once more busy rebuking Administration critics. Reported the *New York Herald-Tribune*:

"President Truman and Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, have emphasized recently that security must take precedence over economy, Mr. Symington said. But he warned that the United States must live within its means as it prepares for war. To do otherwise would endanger this country's economy and way of life and prove disastrous."

INASMUCH as his current billing heralds him as perhaps the country's leading defense expert, Symington's record as Air Force Secretary should be examined closely. Symington's reign from 1947 to 1950 came at a vitally important juncture in US military development. A decade later, space scientist Wernher von Braun was to characterize the Symington tenure as the "lost years" in US missile development. Testified von Braun: "The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. Those six years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost."

The following chart indicates appropriations for missile programs during the period Symington ruled as a top Defense Department policy-maker, contrasted with the "do-nothing Administration" he now attacks:

Fiscal Year	Under Symington	Under GOP Administration
1947	\$ 58 million	
1948	81 "	
1949	98 "	
1950	134 "	
1951	784 "	
1952	(Thomas K. Finletter was Secretary)	
1953	\$ 1,116 million	
1954	1,067 "	
1955	1,470 "	
1956	2,270 "	
1957	4,470 "	
1958	5,107 "	
1959	6,913 "	
1960	6,634 "	
Total	\$1,155 million	\$29,047 million

Senator Lister Hill (D.-Ala.) was to charge three years after Symington left the Pentagon that during most of Symington's administration "not one new aircraft or guided missile project was initiated by the Air Force." Hill did not, as Symington did, hint darkly that President Truman and Defense Secretary Johnson were responsible for the Korean conflict. But he did lay the blame for our lack of modern aircraft in the early days of the war squarely upon Symington's doorstep. Because there was no "aggressive approach to airpower research and development," Senator Hill claimed, "we found ourselves in Korean combat with obsolete, piston-engine aircraft."

Another Symington colleague, Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, has severely criticized Air Force policies prior to Korea. Said Johnson three months after Symington left the Air Force, in July of 1950:

"During this same period, from 1948 to the present, the Air Force—supposedly our first line of defense—has steadily decreased in size and effectiveness."

Early in Symington's senatorial career, the Missourian branded the defense issue as his personal property. In one of his first speeches, Symington told an almost empty Senate chamber that unnamed military "experts" had informed him the Communists were able to carry out a "devastating atomic attack against the United States."

For the next six years, defense became virtually Symington's only interest. In 1956 he personally conducted a Senate investigation into the state of US airpower, and teamed with SAC chief Curtis LeMay to describe the frightening state of Red airpower. The Missouri Senator revealed "intelligence information" that declared the Soviets "will have a substantial quantity over us in long-range bombers for as far in the future as we have estimates." By 1959, declared Symington, the Russians would have "twice as many long-range bombers" as the United States.

Proceeding further, Symington stated flatly that 75 per cent of those bombers, or over a thousand planes, could penetrate our defenses and shower the US with nuclear explosives. An even larger number could get through those defenses, continued Symington, if the Reds outflanked the northeren radar system and swung in at the "soft underbelly" of the US from the Gulf of Mexico. He painted a morbidly-detailed picture:

The 31 SAC bases in the US would be quickly wiped out. Hundreds of military and communications centers would be demolished. Every aircraft factory in the country would be smashed, every important town or city leveled.

Soviet short-range bombers would cover the NATO bases in Europe and the SAC bases on the

other perimeters of the USSR. Fifteen-hundred-mile intermediate-range missiles launched from a fleet of over 400 Red submarines would blanket the rest of the free world.

THE YEARS PASSED and it became apparent that the long-range Red air force is not as formidable as trumpeted. As for the missile-launching subs, they too have yet to pan out. The current Soviet submarine fleet consists only of conventionally-powered vessels. There are no nuclear-powered subs, none with intermediate-range missiles, as far as can be determined.

Symington quietly dropped the "bomber scare" and picked up the "missile threat." He is still at the job, calling periodic press conferences to announce that the Russians have opened up a 3-1 "missile gap" over the US. The same anonymous "intelligence sources" are used to "prove" the Symington claims. To put the situation in a clearer perspective, a confused Washington correspondent interviewed Symington one day recently to discover the basis for the Senator's charges. He reports on his interview:

"For an hour, Symington and I went around and around. Trying to get a straight answer was absolutely impossible. Without a doubt, he is the most evasive politician I have ever talked with. I came out of his office without learning a single proof of his claims."

Many voters wonder what Stuart Symington is doing in the Presidential nomination race. When he announced his candidacy in March, the *Nashville Banner* explained it this way:

"He obviously deems himself as an acceptable 'compromise' candidate—meaning that, by this reckoning, when the convention deadlocks on other hopefuls, it would turn to him as a party balance wheel. He has cultivated the look of availability, but when opportunity didn't knock of it's own volition, he must have decided that if the office wasn't going to seek the man, it was high time for the man to seek the office"

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "The 'MISSILE GAP' IS THE SYMINGTON GAP" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies, \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

The Real Record of Ambassador Lodge

Is He Good Vice-Presidential Timber?

By EDWARD B. SIMMONS

WHEN HENRY CABOT LODGE was elected to the US Senate in 1946, the sky was the only visible limit to his political prospects. At 44, he never had known defeat at the polls. Twice he had been elected to the Massachusetts General Court and three times to the US Senate, all by substantial margins. He had just won by a whopping 340,000 votes over the popular incumbent, David I. Walsh, Democrat, who had served Massachusetts as governor for two years and as US Senator for 26 years.

There were no strings on Cabot Lodge as he resumed his seat in the Senate. He had made no promises in the 1946 campaign. Nor had he alienated the Walsh camp by unkindnesses toward the popular but aging veteran. Even the Truman Administration, still in power, of course, had been well treated by Lodge in the campaign.

Lodge, in person, accented this promise of the future. A resplendent dresser, 6 feet 3 inches tall, moving his 200 pounds with grace, he had glamor enough to charm equally a Back Bay dowager tea or a Lowell labor union rally.

And, carefully underemphasized but suggested for the imagination was the war record, Army combat service overseas, for which he had resigned from the Senate midway in his second term.

The portentous threshold that Henry Cabot Lodge crossed in 1946 opened on to a political lode that seemed richly endowed. Solid popular support, wealth, experience, a distinguished name, persuasive speaking powers and a war record accompanied him to the Senate seat.

What has been the harvest of the intervening 14 years since that impressive entry?

Lodge's next six years as a Senator came to a crashing end in 1952, with his repudiation at the polls in his native state. It was an almost unprecedented dismissal from public office of a three-term Senator in the prime of life.

There have followed eight years for Lodge as chief US Representative in the windy show of the United Nations, a position in which he relieved an aging political veteran who had retired.

It was an all-important period in a public official's life, which saw Cabot Lodge go from 44 years of age to his present 58. Yet it has brought no laurels to compare with those of the long-gone past, like the victory of 1946.

Why has the harvest been lean?

A review of the Lodge record in the 1946-52 Senate, as a leader in the original Eisenhower draft and as spokesman for the United States in the UN, may furnish the answer. In the Senate of that six-year period, some of the most pressing and vital questions of that day, and of this, came to a boiling point.

Among these issues were:

Lodge is being boomed for Vice President. Without delay, write your delegates and alternates to the GOP convention. Give them your opinion.

Internal subversion;

Correction of the Wagner Labor Relations Laws;

Trade with Red nations during the Korean war;

Economy versus spending in the Government;

Strengthening of the two-party system, which had suffered under one-party, almost one-man, domination since 1932.

On these issues, the clean-cut picture of Lodge, the triumphant 1946 campaigner, became so dulled and rounded at the corners as to be hardly recognizable. For example:

Balance between labor and industry—Lodge voted for the Taft-Hartley Act three times in 1947, when it originally was passed. He voted for it in the Senate, for the House-Senate conference version and for overriding President Truman's veto.

BUT IN 1949, when labor union bosses girded for an all-out attack on the law, Lodge voted six times against Taft-Hartley, always with a small minority of Republicans. On five of the six votes, Lodge's voting companion was Senator Morse of Oregon, then a Left-Wing "Republican," now a Left-Wing Democrat.

In 1952, Lodge applied the clincher. With but a week to go in the election contest between himself and then Congressman John F. Kennedy, he abandoned support of Taft-Hartley, which he had again endorsed after 1949, and called for its repeal.

If Senator Lodge's switcheroo had been decisive, the nation would have had, and lost, a Taft-Hartley law on an annual basis.

Internal subversion—The Lodge record here is one for the historians to puzzle out.

After Senator Joseph R. McCarthy made his sensational charges of Communist infiltration of the State Department early in 1950, Senator Lodge assured McCarthy he would call for thorough investigation of the department.

"I think I for one have a special responsibility in that field," said Lodge. He promised to "leave no stone unturned to get at the bottom of the matter." The opportunity came.

Lodge was named to the special Tydings committee to investigate McCarthy's assertions. Lodge dissented from the report of the committee majority, which white-washed the department, but his own report straddled.

Reprinted with permission of *The Standard-Times* of New Bedford, Mass.

It is vital to "relentlessly ferret out disloyalty" in the department, reported Lodge. But he recommended that "we keep a sense of proportion and remember the excellent men and women in the State Department."

He said a cross-section of security officials had assured him "under oath" there were no Communists in the department. He praised the department's security system as having "all the essential elements of a good security system." Those directing it, he said, were of "unquestioned Americanism" and acting in a "conscientious manner."

But while he exonerated the State Department, Lodge returned to the theme of a "relentless investigation" in talks to the folks back home.

"We condemn the fact that several thousand unscreened persons came into the State Department at the stroke of a pen in late 1945 and early 1946," he told a Springfield audience in April, 1951, after the probe.

"All these things must be ruthlessly investigated and the disloyal persons cleaned out and punished," said the Senator who, as with Taft-Hartley, had now run the gamut from pro to con to pro on internal security.

Trade with Communist nations—This was a big issue in the days of the Korean conflict and could be again. Senator Lodge spoke vehemently against such trade.

"Trade in war materials with Red China or Soviet Russia is nefarious and must be stopped," he said in April, 1951.

But Lodge, the Senator, voted three times against efforts to stop such trade; twice in 1950, before the above quotation, and once in 1951, after his demand for an end to the "nefarious" business. In the latter vote, he was the only Republican in the Senate to oppose stopping foreign aid to those nations which sent war goods to the Soviet Union.

Economy versus spending in the government—The Council of State Chambers of Commerce selected the 20 most important rollcalls of 1952 on this issue. Senator Lodge was absent on 14; on those for which he was present he voted three times for spending, three times for economy.

The two-party system—"Fellow Republicans, there never was a time when the American people needed the two-party system more than they need it today," said Lodge in 1951.

But here, too, there was little resemblance between Lodge the orator and Lodge the voter.

A strong two-party system requires that the leaders of each party support their party when the chips are down. Lodge's party loyalty averaged 57 per cent, according to *Congressional Quarterly*. It was one of the lowest in the Senate.

In the 1950-51 period, for example, Lodge voted against the overwhelming majority of Republicans on 59 issues, and against the GOP majority on many other occasions when the division was not so one-sided. (As a comparison, during the same period, Senator Taft, who was not a religiously party-line voter, differed with the GOP majority on but nine issues.)

Is attendance in one's elected office a measure of support for the two-party system?—Being present to explain, promote and defend the two-party system in action?

Senator Lodge's party support was the second worst of all 46 Republicans in the Senate during the last years of his term. He missed 72 of 202 rollcalls in 1951 and 98 of 129 rollcalls in 1952.

At 50, with six more years of Senate service under his belt, Senator Lodge presented this pro-Truman, anti-Republican record to Massachusetts voters in 1952. They rejected it. But they soundly welcomed the candidacy of Lodge's party chief, General Eisenhower.

Lodge lost by 70,000 votes; Eisenhower won by more than 207,000.

The Lodge political lode was beginning to run thin.

IT WAS NOT JUST THE "TRUMAN REPUBLICAN" voting record of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge that bit the dust in the 1952 election. The people of his home state—who knew him best—washed their hands, also, of Lodge's role in one of the most cynical chapters in the history of American Presidential politics.

One has to thumb the history books back to 1878, when the Presidential election was stolen from Samuel J. Tilden, to find anything comparable to the maneuvering that Lodge promoted in order to obtain the Republican nomination for General Eisenhower.

Tilden was cheated out of the Presidency he had won with a majority of the nationwide popular and electoral vote by power politics, openly used.

But the Lodge maneuvers were cloaked as "morality," and the ringleaders laughed at how they deceived the victim and the American public.

The Spring and early Summer of 1952 found the Eisenhower campaign for the Republican nomination moving none too briskly, with Senator Lodge as manager and the general still in Europe.

In mid-June, manager Lodge accused the "Taft forces"—and no exception of the Ohio Senator himself was made—of "shyster methods" in an effort to turn the forthcoming Republican National Convention into a "kangaroo court." He added "attempted theft" and "conniving" to the charges.

The convention opened in July, with a nip-and-tuck struggle between Eisenhower and Taft in prospect.

An important issue confronting the convention was the seating of the delegation from Texas. There were two sets of delegates from the Lone Star State: One, headed by the regular Republican national committeeman from Texas, and chosen by the duly-called GOP convention in that state, was divided 30 delegates for Taft, 4 for General Douglas MacArthur and 4 for General Eisenhower.

The other, elected at a rump GOP convention, was 33 for Eisenhower and 5 for Taft.

The issue was presented to the Republican National Committee meeting at the convention. It approved a compromise delegate slate, offered by Taft, with 22 Taft delegates and 16 for Eisenhower. This slate also was approved by the Credentials Committee of the convention, itself.

Senator Lodge would have none of the compromise.

The Texas contest, he declared, "is a stain on the integrity of our party that we must erase if we are to go to the people with clean hands."

He submitted to the convention, and the television cameras, what he called "our fair play amendment," to change the convention rules so that no state delegation about which there was dispute could vote on any matter before the convention until the dispute was settled.

The long-standing rule of both Republican and Democratic conventions prevented disputed delegations from voting only on issues involving themselves. This is still the rule in the Democratic party's convention.

"Eisenhower leaders sought to exploit the 'fair play issue' not only in Chicago, but in every hamlet and crossroads in the nation," the non-partisan American Political Science Association reported in a study of the 1952 campaign, "Presidential Nominating Politics" in 1952.

The exploitation succeeded.

Delegates who supported Taft but who were unwilling to be pictured as opposing a "fair play amendment" voted for it. The amendment prevailed, and the Texas Taft delegation, as well as those from Louisiana and Georgia, which were overwhelmingly committed to Taft, were not seated.

LODGE HAD WRAPPED THINGS UP for Eisenhower. But was there really a "fair play" label on the package? Was it to "erase a stain" and to acquire "clean hands" that the Lodge cohorts aspired?

One of the most remarkable political documents ever given light was written by Robert Choate, publisher of the Boston *Herald* and an intimate friend of Cabot Lodge, as well as his supporter in every cause and campaign. It appeared in the Boston *Herald*, under Choate's name, immediately after the convention's close—the following is an exactly-quoted excerpt:

"Talking about it (the convention) in retrospect Lodge heaved a sigh of relief.

"That was a close call," he said. "Things were going fast and furious, everyone was talking at once. The convention was waiting for us."

"He laughed. 'When Taft heard I had made the suggestion [of "fair play" rules change] he turned it down. He was always scared of me.'

"Lodge says that he and Herbert Brownell of New York hit on the 'fair play' strategy almost simultaneously.

"I called Brownell on the telephone and by one of those odd coincidences he practically said in the same voice:

"Let's make Texas and Louisiana and some of those other Southern States where we have a good case the fair play issue."

"They sat on the idea for five days seeing if there was any backkick to it.

"Lodge put it up to Max Rabb, the Boston lawyer whom he described as his right arm and his right eye.

"Rabb retorted: 'There is only one chance. They might give us everything. If they do that we are sunk. But we have seen how they react in three conventions and they never let go. The worst thing that could happen to us would be for them to concede us everything. The 68 votes aren't too important. It is worth trying.'"

This was the "fair play" strategy laid bare; by an intimate and well-wishing friend of the chief sponsor.

The objective was not delegate strength from Texas, Louisiana and Georgia.

The objective was not fair play.

In fact, the sponsors staked their all on Taft's sense of fair play and integrity, that he would not admit, whatever the cost, there had been wrongdoing where he felt there had not been.

If Taft made such a concession, said Rabb, "We are sunk."

During this period of the Lodge faction's devotion to "clean hands," assistant signal-caller Rabb was drawing more than \$100 weekly as a "clerical assistant" on the staff of the US Senate Rules Committee, although he never appeared for a day's work with the staff.

After the convention, Senator Lodge turned to Massachusetts campaigning for re-election. The going got tough, and he reached deep for support.

"I've never mentioned or criticized Senator Taft," said the sponsor of the "fair play amendment" that accused Taft of being a thief.

His next address was the United Nations.

AS US AMBASSADOR to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge does not believe there is a clean distinction between right and wrong on an issue. As he has described it, "the black and the white approach" is an over-simplification. He prefers "to bring out the grays in sharp focus."

It is not only necessary to vote on "all three sides of a question," says Lodge, but there "are often more than three sides."

Mr. Lodge has followed this philosophy, astounding as it may seem in an agency that is supposed to be a moral force for good. He has voted on "the shadings and the grays," to use his own words.

As ambassador to the UN, Lodge has been widely praised for "giving the lie" to the Soviet Union, for powerful and quick oratory when the occasion permitted.

This is a role for which he is eminently suited, and Lodge has, indeed, made the welkin ring with denunciation of the Soviet within the UN and with the praise of the UN (and his own) role as savior of peace in talks to the American people.

But how effective has been this oratory?

THE SAME PROBLEMS that divided the non-Communist and Communist worlds when he became spokesman for the West in the UN still divide the two worlds—disarmament, control of outer space, testing of nuclear weapons, partition of Germany.

Name the issue between West and Communist East in 1952—it still is an issue today.

During Ambassador Lodge's tenure at the UN, the two American secretaries of state, the late John Foster Dulles, and now Christian A. Herter, have set new travel records in the quest of lasting peace. In the nearly eight years, there has been an ever-greater dependence on conferences outside of the UN—by foreign ministers or of the "summit" variety—in an effort to resolve issues.

It is not unfair to tie Ambassador Lodge to measurement of UN effectiveness. He stated himself, "Whoever represents the United States there has a lot to do with making the UN succeed."

Aside from long-standing issues, how have Lodge and the UN met critical events arising during his leadership of the West in that agency?

The UN's most definite stand—right or wrong—was taken when it voted to end the Anglo-French-Israel invasion of Egypt, over the Suez Canal. But in this instance, the spokesman for the United States was Secretary of State Dulles, who personally appeared before the General Assembly.

And, recently, the UN Security Council voted down the Soviet resolution condemning the United States for aggressive espionage over the Soviet Union. Ambassador Lodge was effective in disclosing the microphone planted in the Great Seal in the US Embassy in Moscow by Soviet officials.

But the fact is, the issue was already decided. Council members had made clear their intentions, after hearing President Eisenhower speak, that they would not support the Soviet resolution.

Lodge's oratorical efforts "giving the lie" to the Soviet Union availed little or nothing in the crisis arising from the revolution in Hungary. Here was an unique opportunity to crack the Iron Curtain, with all the civilized world outside of the Kremlin anguished by the plight of the Hungarian patriots.

But not even a UN observer got to the scene, although many American newspaper and radio correspondents did so.

In December 1955, the UN suffered a setback that the veteran correspondent of the New York Times, T. J. Hamilton, termed a "revolution" that meant the United States could no longer count on majority support in the General Assembly.

This was the package deal admission of 16 new members, four of them outright Soviet satellites, and several other Asian "neutrals." Control of the Assembly was gained by the African-Asian bloc. Ambassador Lodge "went along" with this deal, in which the Soviet Union obtained the exclusion of Japan in return for agreeing to the exclusion of a fictional state known as Outer Mongolia.

Hungary, one of the puppet satellites thus admitted, got in just in time to deny "officially" any revolution in the next Fall's massacre.

Ambassador Lodge was speaking for the West, too, when UN official Povl Bang-Jensen was ousted, a prelude to his subsequently being found dead under mysterious circumstances.

Bang-Jensen was dismissed from the UN for "insubordination" when he refused to turn over to the Secretariat the names of Hungarian patriot wit-

nesses who had testified, with promise of immunity, on Soviet outrages during the revolution.

Ambassador Lodge declined to intervene in Bang-Jensen's behalf on the grounds it was not his or the US's concern, although the Danish UN official was married to an American citizen.

In the Bang-Jensen affair, as in other matters, Lodge supported UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, whom he describes as "a great friend of the United States," a description not substantiated by the record.

When former Senator Lodge was named ambassador to the United Nations he declared: "There can be no more important duty than that which I am about to undertake."

Ambassador Lodge has worked hard when the UN was in session and he has debated furiously with the Russians. He has toiled, too, to keep his own name politically alive; lately his pace has quickened, as with his ballyhooed trip to the Soviet Union. But somehow the over-all hue is the one to which he subscribes—gray.

The UN has become a kind of gray hanger-on, characterless, unpredictable, so little trusted by Americans that a resolution to add to its authority by repeal of the Connally provision could not even weather a Senate committee.

The gray philosophy rather consistently pops up in the Lodge career since 1946.

It explains how, as a Senator, Lodge could claim to be a Republican while supporting his party only 50 per cent of the time, voting against it on a majority of major issues, and lending only lackadaisical support in attendance.

It is apparent, too, in Lodge's being able to "laugh" while describing how he pinned the label "thief" on a fellow Republican, Senator Taft, in a "fair play amendment" that its sponsor devoutly hoped would not be given fair play.

Only a few weeks ago, he stated to the National Press Club in Washington that "the underprivileged lands constitute a bigger challenge to the free world than the challenge of communism."

This is the jargon of a UN one-worlder, tantamount to saying that foreign aid is more urgent than our own military defense.

Many will not recognize in the author of those words the young man of 1946 who had, indeed, just scored his "greatest triumph." Today's Lodge is no longer in focus.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE REAL RECORD OF AMBASSADOR LODGE" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____